

The University of Chicago

A PHONEMIC ANALYSIS OF THE SPEECH
OF JACQUES PELETIER (1517-1582) WITH
A FACSIMILE OF HIS *DIALOGUE*
DE L'ORTOGRAPHE

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

MARCH, 1945

By
JOSEPH AXELROD

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1948

The University of Chicago

A PHONEMIC ANALYSIS OF THE SPEECH
OF JACQUES PELETIER (1517-1582) WITH
A FACSIMILE OF HIS *DIALOGUE*
DÆ L'ORTOGRAFÆ

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

MARCH, 1945

By
JOSEPH AXELROD

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1948



CHAPTER I

THE SUBJECT: JACQUES PELETIER DU MANS

The present study is in the field of descriptive, that is, synchronic, phonology. Its general aim is to contribute an additional set of data to the existing store of materials which deal with the nature of the French sound structure at different historical periods and which provide the point of departure for studies in historical, that is, diachronic, phonology. A complete picture of the sound structure of a language is possible only after the phonetic patterns which the language exhibits at all stages in its history have been described. The larger the number of stages described, and (for reasons which will be seen presently) the smaller the scope of the descriptions, the greater will be the completeness and accuracy of the picture presented by the diachronic phonologist. But descriptions of various stages of the sound structure of the French language since the Old French period have been too few in number, and most of them have been too broad in scope; for the analyst of the present-day sound pattern of a language begins by limiting his description not only to one locality, one social class, one generation, but to one single individual. The sound patterns in the speech of a grandfather and his grandson, of a northerner and a southerner, of a teacher of speech and a subway conductor, of a city factory worker and a farmhand, although all are native speakers of the same language, may not be identical. Correlations must be made, of course, but only after the descriptions of the sound patterns of a number of individuals

have been completed. The same considerations also hold true in the field of historical descriptive phonology whenever written records exist which would supply sufficient information regarding the speech of a single individual. Such information is to be found, for example, in the rhymes of a given poet (although they alone would not be conclusive), in the correspondence of an unlettered person who did not know how to spell in the acceptedly correct manner (and therefore wrote 's' only where he pronounced [s], etc.), in the work of an exponent of phonetic orthography who did not agree that the acceptedly correct manner of spelling was correct (and therefore wrote 's' only where he pronounced [s]).

It is the specific aim of the present study to analyze the segmental phonemes in the speech of a single individual, Jacques Peletier du Mans, a Frenchman who lived in the sixteenth century and who not only belonged to the lettered class but associated with the most important literary and court figures of his time.¹ It should be made clear at the outset that this fact does not demonstrate that he is a better subject for study than a peasant of his period, or that his pronunciation is to be considered "better" in any absolute sense of the term than that of the peasant,² but is given merely in order to indicate the social class of the individual whose speech is to be analyzed.

Peletier has been chosen as the subject for this study because he used a system of recording his speech which gives a surprisingly clear picture of its sound structure. He was one of

¹For complete biographical data regarding Peletier see C. Jugé, Jacques Peletier du Mans, (Paris: Lemerre, 1907), and the introduction in A. Boulanger, L'Art poétique de Jacques Peletier du Mans, (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930).

²L. Bloomfield, Language, (New York: Holt and Co., 1933), p. 22. R. A. Hall, "Language and Superstition," French Review, XVII (May, 1944), 377-82.

the few men of his period who rebelled against the orthography, then in process of formation, which attempted to show to a greater or lesser degree what the Latin etymons of the French forms were. He devised his own orthographic system which was based on the principle that the orthography of a language should be determined by the phonetics of the language.

In 1555, three important works by Peletier appeared, all of them employing his own graphemic system. The first, L'Art Poëtique, established Peletier's position as a literary critic. The second, L'Amour des Amours, a book of lyric verse, shows Peletier to have been, though hardly the equal of his younger contemporary and admirer, Ronsard, at least a more than mediocre poet. The third work, a second edition of his Dialogue de l'Orthographe et Prononciation Françoisse, gives evidence of the essentially modern spirit of Peletier's thinking about linguistics, and in lively conversational form presents the arguments of the etymological orthographers and their refutation by an exponent of phonetic orthography. It is mainly this work upon which the phonemic analysis which appears in the third and fourth chapters of the present study is based.

The Dialogue begins with an "Apologie a Louïs Meigret." Meigret had preceded Peletier in rejecting the etymological principle in orthography and in devising a graphemic system based on phonetics. In the "Apologie," Peletier points out some of the significant differences between their two systems, and indeed, between their two pronunciations; for Meigret, who was born in Lyons, had come to Paris when he was about thirty years old and had retained his lyonnais pronunciation,³ whereas Peletier had

³C. Thurot, La Prononciation française depuis le commencement du XVIIe siècle, (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881),

come to Paris from Le Mans during early adolescence⁴ and, according to his own statement, had observed court pronunciation so intently and had imitated it so successfully that he lost all traces of his provincial accent. For he says in the Dialogue:

Combien qu' j' soë d'un païs, ou la prolacion, voer' l' lan-
gag' sont assez vicieus (comm' j' suis contreint d' confesser)
toutfoes j' pans' auer' gagne ç' point au moyen d' la refor-
macion qu' m' suis impose' moemem', qu' a bon droet n' s'
pourra dir' d' moe', qu' mon parler s'ant' son terro'. E par
c' qu' j' e' tousjors ete' d' l' opinion d' ceus qui ont dit
qu' an notr' France n' i a androet ou lon parl' pur François,
fors la ou et la Court, ou bien la ou sont ceus qui i ont
ete' nourriz: j' m' i suis volontiers g'ete' toutes les foes
qu' an e' u l' occasion: laquels assez d' foes j' e' üs.⁵

The difference between his pronunciation and graphemic system, and those of Meigret, led Peletier to make a number of statements in the "Apologie" which are of considerable aid in establishing more precisely than would otherwise be possible the nature of the sounds represented by some of his graphemes.⁶

The Dialogue proper presents the conversations of four men, Bèze, Martin, Sauvage -- well-known sixteenth century figures -- and Dauron, the exponent of phonetic spelling. Whether, like the other three, Dauron was an actual person, or a figment of Peletier's imagination, is an interesting question. Jugé, a bio-

xxvii. M. Pope, From Latin to Modern French, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1934), p. 38. F. Brunot, Histoire de la langue française, (Paris: Armand Colin, 1906), II, 95ff., gives a complete list of Meigret's works and an excellent resume of his principles.

⁴Boulanger, op. cit., p. 10.

⁵J. Peletier, Dialogue d' l'Ortograf' e Prononciacion François, (2nd ed.; Lyons: Jean de Tournes, 1555), p. 23. Chapter V of the present study consists of a facsimile of this edition. All citations, unless otherwise noted, refer to this second edition.

⁶The word "grapheme" is preferable to "letter" since 'e', 'q', 'é', 'ê', for example, are different graphemes but are not different letters. Furthermore, a single grapheme may consist of two or three letters. "Grapheme" is preferable also to the more inclusive term "symbol."

grapher of Peletier, supplies information about the other three,⁷ but in the case of Dauron, he was not able to find "d'autre renseignement que ceux donnés par Peletier."⁸ According to the description given in the Dialogue, Dauron kept "compagnie a monsigneur l'Euêque de Montpellier" and "etoët tout resolu es Langues non seulémant lettrées, mes aussi vulguères: puis an touté sorté de Philosophie, an Loës, e mèmes an notré Matematique."⁹ Jugé concludes therefore that Dauron "a donc le savoir encyclopédique de Peletier"¹⁰ but it does not occur to him that Dauron might well be Peletier himself. For if "du Mans" is substituted for "de Montpellier" in the description of Dauron given in the Dialogue, then every point in that description applies equally to Peletier. In the 1540's, when the writing of these conversations was taking place (the Dialogue having been completed by 1547),¹¹ Peletier was "Secreteré de Monsigneur l'Euêque du Mans";¹² he was certainly "tout resolu" in the classical languages, having translated Homer (1547) and Horace (1544); he indicates in the Dialogue how proud he was of his knowledge of Italian and Spanish;¹³ he had studied law for five years;¹⁴ and he had written several works on mathematics (1545, 1547). But the clearest indication that Dauron, in all likelihood, is Peletier is to be seen in the fact that the linguistic principles which Dauron expresses are the very ones upon which Peletier's entire orthographic system is based, and

⁷Jugé, op. cit., pp. 82-3, 112-13.

⁸Ibid., p. 113.

⁹Dialogue, p. 35.

¹⁰Jugé, op. cit., p. 114.

¹¹The "privilège du roi" is dated 1547. Dialogue (1550 ed.), unnumbered page preceding the dedication.

¹²Dialogue, p. 6.

¹³Ibid., pp. 31f.

¹⁴Jugé, op. cit., p. 17.

the specific graphemic innovations which Dauron recommends are the very ones which appear in Peletier's orthography.

The linguistic principles which Dauron expresses show the striking modernism of Peletier's ideas about language. Three fundamental propositions of modern linguistic science are that "language is primarily an auditory system of symbols" and "the written forms are secondary symbols of the spoken ones";¹⁵ that "every language is undergoing at all times, a slow but unceasing process of linguistic change";¹⁶ and that the commonly-held belief that "languages are preserved by the usage of educated and careful people and changed by the corruptions of the vulgar" is erroneous.¹⁷ The following passages from the Dialogue show that these are the ideas which form the basis of Peletier's attitude toward language.

Dauron expresses the idea that language is an "objet de l'ouïe"¹⁸ and that writing comes after, and is secondary to, speech:

Prononciacion ... n'ët autre chose qu'un mouuëmant de langue e des autres instrumens a ce duisans, par lequel les mox se font antandre au sans de l'ouïe. E par ce que l'efet an et de petite duree, e memes n'ët suffisant pour penetrer la distance des lieux, sinon qu'el se soit bien petite: il a ete necessaire d'inuenter quelque moyen pour suplir tel defaut: a ce que les absans e les suruius pussent auoir communication de ce que l'elongnement des lieux e du tans ne leur pouuoët permettre. An quoe, n'ut ete possible d'imaginer chose plus commode que l'Ecriture, qui et une disposition de lettres, representant les mox significatiz de quelque langage que ce soit. Laquelle tient la place de la parole: de sorte que si la voëe pouuoët etre par tout e perpetuellement antandue: nous n'aurions que fere de metre rien par escrit. Voila l'usage, auquel et destinee l'Ecriture, qui et depuis le parler, comme chacun set.¹⁹

He expresses the idea that language changes and that

¹⁵E. Sapir, Language, (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1921), pp. 17, 19.

¹⁶Bloomfield, op. cit., p. 281.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁸Dialogue, p. 80.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 76-7.

methods of recording it must be adjusted to these changes; for if the orthography is reformed, he says, future generations "sauront par ce moyen comme lon prononçoit de nostre tans. E s'il auient qu'elz se changent an mieus: iz acõmoderont leur mode d'ecrire a leur mode de parler, comme nous aurons fet a la nostre."²⁰ A time will come, he says, when the French language "ne se trouuera plus tel qu'elz est de present, sinon dedans les Liures."²¹

And he expresses the idea that language is the voice of the people:

La prolacion consistet an la langue de tout un peuple: Antré lequel, non la plus seint partie, mes la plus grande, domine. ... Les g'ans doctes ... sont an petit nombre, e le plus souuent separez du vulguere, pour leurs etudes ou autres afers serieus.²²

Dauron agrees of course "que quant a la richesse, propriete e dousseur: les personnages d'esprit qui vienent avec le tans, an prennent la charge."²³ But it is precisely the members of this lettered class and the Latinists among them who are instrumental in the establishment of a system of recording speech which, according to Peletier, "est si corrompu, e represente si peu ce qu'elz doit ressembler, qu'on la peut resonnablement comparer a une robe de plusieurs pieces mal rapportees."²⁴ Yet the lettered elite are eager to preserve a system of recording speech which will deepen the breach between them and the common people precisely because (in the words which Peletier puts into the mouth of Bèze) "il faut qu'il y ait quelque difference entre la maniere d'ecrire des g'ans doctes, e des g'ans mecaniques."²⁵ Bèze expresses here the very core of the attitude which, overtly expressed or camouflaged, has been at the basis of the arguments that, at

²⁰Ibid., p. 87. ²¹Ibid., p. 79. ²²Ibid., p. 123.

²³Ibid., pp. 123-24. ²⁴Ibid., p. 6. ²⁵Ibid., p. 52.

every stage in the history of those languages where such a bifurcation has taken place, are adduced by upholders of an established but irrational method of recording speech.²⁶ In his attack upon this fallacious point of view, Peletier (through Dauron) expresses once more his deep-seated conviction that language is auditory:

Veut on forç a croèr a un peuple, què l'intelig'ancè dè son langage git an un papier, e nompas au parler? an l'Ecriturè e nompas an la prolacion? an l'eulh, e nompas an l'oreilhè? ... Iè demandèroè voutontiers, si les moz qui sont par ecrit, sont autrès moz què ceus què la languè prononcè.²⁷

Peletier's fundamental principle of recording language, then, is that writing "nè doèt auoèr autrè usagè ni puissancè, fors cèlè què la Prolacion lui donnè."²⁸ In the "Apologiè" he tells Meigret that both of them have one basic aim: "raporter l'Ecriturè a la Prolacion: C'èt notrè but, c'èt notrè point, c'èt notrè fin: sommè c'èt notrè uniuèrsèl acord."²⁹ In the attainment of that aim, the general rule to be followed is: "Il faut ecrirè sèlon qu'on prononcè,"³⁰ that is, "mèttrè les lèttrès qui sè prononcèt, e nè mèttrè point cèlès qui nè sè prononcèt point."³¹

It was mainly in the second of these respects that the orthography in vogue in 1550 erred -- it made great use of "lèttrès qui nè sè prononcèt point." Peletier therefore calls special attention to this problem: "Il faut surtout euter superfluite."³² Superfluous letters had been added by the Latinists who used this means of relating French words to their etymons. Some of them,

²⁶In our own times, for example, when the Brazilian government introduced a reformed spelling and then abandoned it temporarily, the Portuguese staff of the Bulletin of the Pan American Union admits it was "secretly delighted"; for "after all we had battled heroically in childhood to get our ch's, ph's, th's, ç's, ss's, and double consonants in the right place." A. d'Armond Marchant, "Brazilian Spelling and Geographic Names," Bulletin of the Pan American Union, LXXVII (May, 1943), 254.

²⁷Dialoguè, pp. 80-1.

²⁸Ibid., p. 26.

²⁹Ibid., p. 9.

³⁰Ibid., p. 114.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

indeed, were willing to go so far as to write the medial consonant of 'lisons' with the grapheme 'g' in order to recall the 'g' of the Latin etymon, or the medial consonant of 'poisser' with the grapheme 'c' in order to recall the 'c' of the Latin etymon;³³ but in the accepted orthography of the sixteenth century, the etymological letters were inserted inconsistently and at times even incorrectly. Peletier objects as much to the inconsistent application of the etymological principle as to the principle itself:

Nous escriuons la con jonccion copulatiue, et, par t, lequel nous ne prononçons nullement: e ne le faisons sinon que pourau tant qu'el vient du Latin et: quel propos i a il, nomplus que d'ecrir la Preposicion a, par d, qui vient du Latin ad?"³⁴

Thus, once the tradition has been set, it is difficult to reform spelling in the direction of consistency, no matter which principle is involved; the lettered class would be as averse to writing ad for a as it would be to writing e for et.

Peletier realizes, therefore, that public acceptance of a phonetic spelling can come only after a long evolution and that he himself, in devising a system which will be acceptable to his contemporaries, can take only the first steps in the direction of a rational orthography based on the phonetic principle. As he looks upon the situation in 1550, he concludes: "Ils voient tout cela estre quasi incorrigible, si ce n'est a grand' difficulte e longueur de tans."³⁵ He criticizes Meigret for attempting too great and too sudden a reform, thus endangering the whole cause. Yet he realizes too that disagreements among the reformers will also endanger the cause and he makes the attempt therefore to agree with Meigret "an

³³Brunot, op. cit., II, 94.

³⁴Dialogue, p. 114.

³⁵Ibid., p. 105.

tout çø quø gracieusète e honnêtète ont pù permetre";³⁶ but in the "Apologîe" to Meigret he offers this bit of advice:

Nø fêsons point dirø dø nous, quø nous voulons passer dø forcø e par sus les muralhès, quand les portès sont ouvertès: n'antrons point si a la foulø, auant quø les logis soët preparez: gagnons premièremant les keurs des hommès, an leur proposant les condicions moins soupçonneusès, e qui honnêtement nø sø peuuèt refuser. Puis nous leur metrons les autrès an auant, quand iz sèront un peu mieus pratiquez, e assurez. Croë moë, que si nous pouuons corriger les abus les plus manifestès, nous aurons bien bèsogne. Fêsons l'un après l'autrø: e nous voèrrons, quø quasi sans nous an ètrø notablement aperçuz, nos rèsons auront trouuè lieu anuers tout un peuplø. Puis il an viendra d'autrès après nous, qui acheuèront çø quø nous aurons, nompas oublie, mès seulèmant dissimule.³⁷

Dauron, in the Dialogue itself, expresses this idea again and again:

Il n'èt possible dø tout regler. Mès pour lø moins, reglons çø quø nous pourrons.³⁸

Mès çø sèra, peu a peu, e pour l'auènr, qui voudra.³⁹

L'èmp autamt lèsser passer çøla par amour quø par forcø.⁴⁰

Peletier therefore disagrees with Meigret's inclusion in his orthography of certain minor reforms which might well be omitted in the first presentation to the public of reformed spelling. Meigret, for example, writes qu simply as 'q' since the u is always silent; Peletier realizes as well as Meigret that qu is not the ideal grapheme for /k/ -- 'k', he says, would be better⁴¹-- but since the u of qu is always silent in this position, since therefore the grapheme 'qu' in traditional spelling always represents /k/, Peletier concludes: "Iø trouuø meilleur qu'on n'i touchø point pour cetø heurø."⁴² However, the case of the two significantly phonetically distinct words traditionally spelled 'espris' ("qui vient dø eprandrø") and 'espriz' ("qui vient du

³⁶Ibid., p. 7. ³⁷Ibid., p. 18. ³⁸Ibid., p. 132.

³⁹Ibid., p. 110. ⁴⁰Ibid., p. 105. ⁴¹Ibid., p. 15.

⁴²Ibid., p. 16.

singulier, esprit")⁴³ is not the same, for here the second grapheme, 's', represents /s/ in one word, and in the other it does not; such words, Peletier tells his colleague, "meritēt reformation, non pas ceus qui s'ecriuent d'unŕ sortŕ qui ēēt tous-jours samblablŕ a soŕ, e qui james nŕ sŕ demant."⁴⁴

Thus Peletier believes that it is wisest to compromise with traditional orthography and retain the traditional graphemes which in a given position in the word represent always the same phoneme. In his graphemic system, therefore, the same grapheme in a particular position represents always the same phoneme, but a particular phoneme may be recorded by a number of graphemes.

These same practical considerations lead Peletier to a rejection of the idea of using new graphemes. A thorough reform of the method of recording the language would necessarily entail a number of new graphemes; "si nous rŕgardons," he says, "quŕ pour reformer notrŕ Escriturŕ tout au parfŕt, il nous faudroēt auoŕ lŕtrŕs toutŕs nouuŕlŕs."⁴⁵ Peletier lists the sounds which are represented by an ambiguous one-letter grapheme or a grapheme composed of two letters, each of which is used to represent some other phoneme; these are: the initial consonant of 'valet' (which occasionally represents also /y/), of his own given name, 'Iaquŕs', and of 'charite'; the medial consonant of 'gagner'; and the last consonant of 'batalhŕ'.⁴⁶ But the introduction of new graphemes for these sounds is too revolutionary; Peletier places Dauron among those "qui les voudroēt rŕcŕuoŕr s'ŕlŕs etoēt inuanteŕs par un autrŕ, plus tŕt quŕ les inuanter."⁴⁷ For he does not believe the public would ever tolerate new graphemes, and concludes there-

⁴³Ibid., p. 13.

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 13-14.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 12.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 11.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 118.

fore:

Nous trouuons qu' mieus vaut la lèsser einsi. Car cè n'è
s'roet jàmes fèt. Notrè Langue auroet perdu son usagè,
auant qu' nous pussions mètrè tel's nouueautez an la bonnè
gracè des François.⁴⁸

But it was not only the taste of the public which deter-
mined Peletier's attitude on this matter. He had also to keep the
printers in mind. When so many of them were unwilling to use even
the cedilla and apostrophe,⁴⁹ there was little hope that they
would adopt untraditional graphemes. A printer who was not typical
in this respect was Jean de Tournes in Lyons, who was Peletier's
publisher in 1554 and 1555 and who maintained an excellent repu-
tation⁵⁰ at a time when printers felt no need to hesitate in
taking liberties with the style or spelling of any text. Peletier
himself recounts an experience of this nature. During one of the
conversation sessions described in the Dialogue, he glances through
a work of his which has just come off the press, and expresses con-
siderable dissatisfaction. Sauvage asks him what the trouble is,
and he replies:

J'è confessè ... qu' c'è qui m'à plus eide à m'è changer la cherè,
à ètè c'è qu' j'è vu dedans mes Euurès qui n'ètoet pas mien.
Lors l'è Signeur Ian Martin prènant la parolè, Si n'è crèejè
pas, dit il, qu' vous ètant presant à l'impression, eyez sou-
fèrt qu'on i' èt mis chosè qui n'è soèt votrè. Si è, di j'è,
j'è l'è soufèrt è malgre moè: dont j'è n'è suis à m'è repantir:
Car il m'è samblè qu' quand on aportè quelqu' Liurè a un Im-
primeur, l'è moins d'è gracieusète qu'il puissè fèrè, èt d'è
suiurè la minutè d'è celui qui l'è fèt.⁵¹

Bèze suggests, however, that the printer who refused to follow
Peletier's peculiar spelling was in fact doing him a service. If
Bèze is right, then Jean de Tournes did Peletier no service. In-
deed, de Tournes was so won over by Peletier's graphemic system
that he used it also in printing works by other authors, including

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 12.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 105.

⁵⁰Thurot, op. cit., I, 44.

⁵¹Dialogue, pp. 36-37.

Louise Labe and Desmasures.⁵² It is not surprising, therefore, that he printed the Dialogue, as Beaulieux states, "d'une façon remarquable et presque sans faute."⁵³

In view of the fact that no edition of the Dialogue has appeared since 1555, it was decided to include in the present study a facsimile edition of this work. It is obvious, however, that the usual paraphernalia accompanying an edition of a text of literary import are superfluous in this case. The de Tournes edition of the Dialogue, as mentioned above, is the second, the work having been previously printed in 1550 at Poitiers. The first edition, however, has many typographical errors and traditional spellings, for which the printer apologizes in a preliminary section entitled "Aus lecteurs":

Messieurs, vous deuëz, pour trois rēsons, excuser amiable-
ment les fautes qui se presentēront à voz yeus, an lisant vne
chose si ingenieusement inuante que ce present Traitte. L'une
et l'absance de l'Auteur. L'autre la nouveaute du suget,
tellement esloigne de nostre comun vsage d'ecrire ... qu'il ne
se fait point emerveiller, si ses preceptes memes ne sont
gardez de tous poins an lui, pour la premiere impression.⁵⁴

The second edition was therefore chosen for reproduction here. A second reason for this choice is that a copy of the 1550 edition is available in the United States at the Harvard University Libraries, whereas, so far as could be established, no copy of the second edition exists in this country. The facsimile in the present study is a reproduction of the copy in the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris.

⁵²C. Beaulieux, Histoire de l'orthographe française, (Paris: Champion, 1927), I, 291.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴Dialogue (1550 ed.), "Aus lecteurs," page unnumbered.

CHAPTER III

THE ANALYSIS: VOWELS

1.0 Peletier's description and recording of his speech indicate that it contained the following nineteen vowel phonemes:

i	i:	y	y:	u	u:
e	e:			o	o:
ẽ		ø	ø̃	õ	
ɛ	ɛ:			õ	
		ã			
		a	a:		

The number of occurrences¹ in the portion checked for each of these vowel phonemes is as follows:

i	760	ø	1,324
i:	5	o	194
y	251	o:	4
y:	8	a	653
u	487	a:	5
u:	4	ẽ	123
e	732	ø̃	23
e:	15	õ	295
ɛ	331	ã	427
ɛ:	89		

Thus, of the total number of 12,678 sounds checked, 5,820 were vowels.

If Peletier has recorded and described his speech accurately, there was a phonemic distinction between the short and long vowels. Dauron, Peletier's mouthpiece in the Dialogue, explains to Sauvage, one of the defenders of traditional orthography, how

¹Percentages are given in the Appendix.

an acute accent may be used to distinguish between the short and long vowels:

De votr^e acçant agu, il s^era bon d'an user sus les silab^es longu^es, quand il i aura diferanç^e d^e longueur e brieu^ete qui puisse aporter dout^e: Bien qu^e j^e sache c^ela n'êtr^e son propre ofic^e: E on pourra mettr^e un acçant grand sus les silab^es brieu^es: Comm^e il eschêt souvant aus tierç^es personⁿes singulier^es e pluri^eres des Verb^es: l^equele^s se prononç^et d^e m^em^e sort^e, excete qu^e la singulier^e et brieu^e, e la pluri^ere longu^e. Comm^e il aloet, e iz aloet: il soet, e iz soet. Quelqu^efoes aussi des personⁿes singulier^es les un^s sont brieu^es e les autr^es longu^es: m^es c'ê^t an diuers tans. Comm^e quand nous disons, j^e croe qu'il ut: e j^e voudre^e qu'il ut: Autant d^e fût e fut: dît e dit: e autr^es.²

Thus, Dauron has established as minimal contrastive pairs 'aloet': 'aloet', 'ût : ût', 'fût : fût', 'dît : dît'. Bèze, another speaker in the Dialogue, who like Sauvage favors traditional orthography, expresses his satisfaction with the traditional method of showing length by the grapheme 's' and he offers the following pairs: 'tempest^e : trompett^e', 'past^e : pat^e', 'host^e : hot^e', 'tistr^e : tiltr^e'.³ Before Dauron explains that the acute accent may be used to distinguish between a long and short vowel, Bèze objects to the removal of a silent 's' where it represents length, for if the 's' were to be removed from 'naist', 'croist', 'paist', then these words, says Bèze, "s^e pourro^et proferer bri^ez, e represan- ter autr^e chos^e qu'on n^e pans^ero^et."⁴ There can be little doubt, therefore, that the distinction which Dauron and Bèze make between their long and short vowels is a phonemic one.

The discussion of the vowel sounds is arranged in the following order: the high oral vowels (§1.1), the mid oral vowels (§1.2), the low oral vowels (§1.3), the nasal vowels (§1.4).

1.1 The high vowel phonemes recorded were: front /i, i:/, front rounded /y, y:/, back /u, u:/.

²J. Peletier, Dialogue de l'Orthographe e Prononciacion François^e (2nd ed.; Lyons: Jean de Tournes, 1555), p. 106.

³Ibid., p. 58.

⁴Ibid.

1.11 The long high vowels, like all of the long vowels except /ɛ:/, showed a low frequency: /i:/ 5, /y:/ 8, /u:/ 4; examples: 'fit', 'ût', 'gôûter'. Although in general, in the Amour a long vowel rhymes with a long vowel, Peletier allows /i/ and /y/ to rhyme with /i:/ and /y:/ in 'flutɕ : afûtɕ', 'pôtiz : vetiz'.⁵ In the portion checked, long high vowels occurred initially and medially but not finally in the word.

1.12 The number of occurrences of the three short high vowels is: /i/ 760, /y/ 251, /u/ 487. These three phonemes occurred in initial, medial, and final positions as syllabics. They also occurred as non-syllabics in complementary distribution with their occurrences as syllabics.

1.121 Syllabic /i, y, u/ occurred in the syllable finally and pre-consonantly (pre-vocalic position is discussed below, §1.122); the consonant which followed in the same syllable was always one of the group /p, t, k, l, r, s/. The number of occurrences of syllabic /i, y, u/ as a complete form (i.e., as the words 'i', 'u', 'ou') and in the three positions in free and checked syllables in the word is as follows:

	Complete Form	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
i Free	6	9	222	168	405
i Checked	...	54	78	...	132
y Free	6	23	67	34	130
y Checked	...	2	54	...	56
u Free	27	3	75	0	105
u Checked	...	0	117	...	117

1.122 When unstressed /i, y, u/ appeared before or after certain syllabics, these high vowels were non-syllabic. They

⁵J. Peletier, L'Amour des Amours, ed. Ad. van Bever (Paris: Société des Médecins Bibliophiles, 1926), pp. 127, 151. This is a facsimile of the 1555 edition.

never appeared in combination with the homorganic syllabic.

In the Dialogue, Peletier gives as examples of monosyllables the words 'miɛl', 'fiɛl', 'ciɛl'⁶ and in L'Art Poétique, he says that the poet, "s'il sɛ trouuɛ bien a propos, sɛ pourra dɛpartir la silabɛ: commɛ miɛl, fiɛl, hiɛr: mɛs rarɛmant ɛ dextrɛmant."⁷

NS⁸ /i, y, u/ all occurred medially; NS /u/ occurred also initially; NS /i/ occurred also finally.

NS /y/ occurred only pre-vocalically. NS /i/ occurred pre-, inter-, and post-vocalically. NS /u/ occurred pre-vocalically and, if Peletier's recording 'au' is to be analyzed as /au/, also post-vocalically. But during the sixteenth century, the earlier /au/ was in the process of assimilating into an undiphthongized close mid-back vowel. If this assimilation had already taken place in Peletier's speech, there are no indications of it in the Dialogue. On the contrary, the following considerations indicate that 'au' is composed of an allophone of /a/ + a back glide.

Peletier objects to Meigret's grapheme 'ao' on the grounds that it may lead his readers into the error of accepting as proper the substandard Parisian pronunciation for 'eau' which Peletier records as 'io';⁹ here, therefore, Peletier seems to brand the pronunciation of a pure mid-back vowel for 'au' as a vulgarity.

That 'au' was not [o] in Peletier's speech is shown more

⁶Dialogue, p. 21.

⁷J. Peletier, L'Art Poétique, ed. André Boulanger (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930), p. 211.

⁸"NS" is an abbreviation for "non-syllabic."

⁹Dialogue, p. 17.

clearly by a remark which Dauron makes in his discussion of the nasal vowel /ã/; in Normandy, Brittany, Anjou, and Maine, Dauron says, "iz prononcét l'a dauant n un peu bien grossémant, e quasi commé s'il i auçèt aun par diftonguê."¹⁰ The 'au' of 'aun' must thus clearly represent a low vowel + [w], for if it represents [o] then the dialectal pronunciation of /ã/ which Dauron is describing here would be near enough to /õ/ so that the comparison with it would have been inevitable. The 'au' in this particular case must represent [aw] and it is therefore unlikely that 'au' generally represents [o].

There is one other piece of evidence to strengthen the hypothesis that Peletier's 'au' was not a pure vowel. In the Dialoguê he compares Latin 'cautela', 'causa' with French 'cautêlê', 'causê'; the first syllables of each Latin and French pair, he says, are pronounced in the same manner.¹¹ But no evidence can be drawn from this statement until it can be shown that Peletier did not pronounce Latin 'au' as a pure mid-back vowel. His ridicule and attack of the gallicized pronunciation of Latin¹² is not conclusive, but when he points out "la procheintête quê tousjourns a üê la Diftonguê"¹³ au auçê la voyêlê o: commé on sèt par les moz Latins caudex e codex,"¹⁴ then it may be assumed that for him these two Latin forms differ in pronunciation, that therefore Latin 'au' is not pronounced [o], and consequently that French 'au' is likewise not [o]; 'au' in Peletier's speech, then, had not yet reached the stage of an assimilated diphthong.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 124.

¹¹Ibid., p. 17.

¹²Ibid., p. 120.

¹³The word 'diftonguê' sheds no light upon the question, for in Peletier's usage, it refers to graphemics only and includes 'ou' and 'eu' as well as 'au'.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 17.

At the same time, 'au' is not a succession of two syllabics, for Peletier finds that it is different from the Latin diphthongs 'ae' and 'oe', "la ou les deus voyel~~s~~ sont distinct~~es~~ sansi- bl~~s~~." ¹⁵ He looks upon 'au' as one sound, and indeed compares it in its "simplicite de prolacion" with 'ou' and 'eu'; ¹⁶ yet this cannot be taken as evidence that 'au' was a pure vowel in his speech, for English /ej/ and /ow/, for example, are not pure vowels and yet are regarded as single sounds by phonetically naive speakers of the language. The conclusion to be drawn, therefore, is that 'au' must be analyzed as /au/; in all probability the /a/ before /u/ had been raised and is therefore to be considered an allophone of /a/, in complementary distribution with a lower and more central /a/ allophone, and in complementary distribution also with any allophone of /o/.

In view of the evidence presented, it is difficult to see how Brunot arrives at his conclusion regarding Peletier's 'au': "Peletier et Ramus y voient un son simple o," ¹⁷ or how Beaulieux can state categorically: "Chez Peletier et d'autres la réduction à o était faite." ¹⁸

Pre-vocalically, only /u/ appeared in initial position (2 occurrences, 'o~~e~~siu~~e~~te'); in medial position, the number of occurrences of /C + i, y, u + V/ is: /i/ 157, /y/ 65, /u/ 182. In the portion checked, NS /u/ occurred, with one exception ('ou!'), only before the two open mid-front oral vowels /e, e:/; Peletier's recording of 'louër', 'auouër', indicates that in these words, in contrast to 'auo~~e~~r', the /u/ is syllabic. NS /y/ occurred only

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷F. Brunot, Histoire de la langue française (Paris: Armand Colin, 1906), II, 260.

¹⁸C. Beaulieux, Histoire de l'orthographe française (Paris: Champion, 1927), I, 229.

before /i/ except in three cases where it was followed by /ɛ:, e, ã/; NS /i/ occurred before the following vowels: /e/ 41, /ø/ 20, /a/ 11, /ẽ/ 45, /õ/ 38, /ã/ 2.

Intervocally, /i/ alone appeared (22 occurrences; 'moyen').

Post-vocally, /u/ occurred only after /a/; /i/ occurred after /e/ (only the word 'vrɛi' shows NS /i/ after /ɛ/; the feminine, however, is often 'vrɛp') and after the nasal vowels /ẽ, õ/ in which case the /i/ was nasalized (allophone [ĩ]); the combination /ĩi/ is discussed more fully above, §1.43, in connection with the nasal vowels). Post-vocalic /u/ appeared only medially (81 occurrences, 'faut'); post-vocalic /i/ appeared medially and finally, with the following frequencies:

	Medial /i/	Final /i/
After /e/	8	1
After /ẽ/	12	3
After /õ/	18	2
Totals	38	6

In the 38 occurrences of /ViC/ shown, the consonant which followed /i/ was in every case one of the group /t, d, n, s/, e.g., /t/ and /n/, 'lointein'; /d/, 'eider'; /s/, 'einsi'. Graphemically, 'ei' appeared also before /p/ (5 occurrences) and /ɬ/ (4 occurrences) as in 'anseigner', 'meilheur', but it is doubtful whether this 'i' is phonemic, for in using 'i', Peletier may simply have recorded the transitional glide between /e/ and the palatal consonant, or he may have imitated the popular graphemes 'ign' and 'ill' for /p, ɬ/. The use of 'i' in this case would be a matter of indifference to him since it could not be mistaken for a syllabic; in a word like 'egulhon', however, where the traditional grapheme 'ill' would lead to confusion, Peletier omits

the 'i' and criticizes Meigret for not doing so.¹⁹

1.123 Thus, the allophones of the short high vowel phonemes are: /i/, [i, j, ʃ]; /y/, [y, u]; /u/, [u, w]. The graphemes which Peletier used to represent the short high front vowels are: /i/, 'i' and 'y'; /y/, 'v' initially and 'u' medially (the same graphemes as for /v/; see below, §2.44); /u/, 'ou' and 'o' (before 'e').

1.2 The mid oral vowel phonemes recorded were: front /e, e:, e, e:/, front rounded /ø/, back /o, o:/.

1.21 The mid front vowels occurred with the following frequency: /e/ 732, /e:/ 15, /e/ 331, /e:/ 89. If Peletier has correctly recorded his speech, then his 'e' ("e pur") and his 'e' ("e cler") are not allophones of the same phoneme (as some analysts believe is the case in present-day French),²⁰ but constitute separate phonemes. A minimal contrastive pair is 'mes' my, and 'mēs' but. The long and the short mid-front oral vowels in present-day French are, according to the same analysts, phonemically distinct, 'mettre : maître', and Peletier's transcription indicates that this was true of his speech, 'mêtrø : mêttrø', 'il aloët : iz aloët'. The number of occurrences of the mid front vowels as a complete form and in the three positions in free and checked syllables in the portion checked is as follows:

	Complete Form	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
e Free	149	67	187	76	471
e Checked	...	17	244	...	261
e: Free	...	0	15	0	15
e: Checked	...	0	0	...	0

¹⁹Dialogué, p. 15.

²⁰G. L. Trager, "The Verb Morphology of Spoken French," Language, XX (July-September, 1944), 132. R. E. Hall, "Language and Superstition," French Review, XVII (May, 1944), 132.

	Complete Form	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
ɛ Free	...	10	88	27	125
ɛ Checked	...	6	200	...	206
ɛ: Free	...	18	21	12	51
ɛ: Checked	...	26	12	...	38

All of the initial occurrences of /ɛ:/ were in parts of the verb 'étré'. In all final occurrences of both /ɛ/ and /ɛ:/, these vowels appeared after non-syllabic /u/; 104 of the 200 cases of medial checked /ɛ/ and 11 of the 12 cases of medial checked /ɛ:/ likewise appeared after non-syllabic /u/. /ɛ/ in these occurrences showed a complementary distribution with /e/ which did not occur in combination with non-syllabic /u/. In checked syllables, the consonants which appeared after these phonemes and the number of occurrences are as follows:

/V/	/Vp/	/Vt/	/Vk/	/Vl/	/Vr/	/Vf/	/Vs/
e	1	1	8	30	83	5	133
ɛ	0	75	13	1	67	0	50

1.22 The mid front rounded vowel phoneme /ø/ (1,324 occurrences) has a stressed allophone [ø], recorded by Peletier as 'eu', an unstressed allophone [e], recorded by Peletier as 'ø' (cf. the English allophones [ʌ] and [ə]), and a zero allophone, also recorded 'ø'. The number of occurrences of the stressed and unstressed allophones in the three positions and in free and checked syllables is as follows:

	Complete Form	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
[ø] Free	...	5	20	16	41
[ø] Checked	...	5	86	...	91
[e] Free	...	1	165	875	1041
[e] Checked	...	0	151	...	151

In a checked syllable, [e] was followed only by /t/ (23 occur-

rences) and /s/ (128 occurrences); [ʃ] was followed by /r/ and /ʒ/ as well as /t/ and /s/, with these frequencies: /t/ 6, /r/ 50, /s/ 34, /ʒ/ 1.

When final unstressed /ə/ was followed by an initial vowel in close juncture, it reduced to zero. This is clearly shown in the Dialogue when Peletier disagrees with Meigret's method of noting this reduction by the substitution of an apostrophe for the grapheme:

Sans r  son tu   tes l'  f  minin, au lieu duquel tu m  tz un apostroph   a la fin des diccions, quand l   mot s  luitant s  commence par voyell  . E c   qui l   m   f  t dir  ,   t qu   lon peut arr  ter, e bien souvant s'arr  t   lon an lisant, sus la fin d   tel  s diccions, ancor  s qu   l   point n'i s  t pas: e an s'i arr  tant, c'  t forc   d   prononcer l'  . Il faudr  t par m  m   r  son   ter quasi toutes autres l  t  s finales, lequell  s nous n   pronon  ons point au parler continu.²¹

There is no indication in the Dialogue that stressed /  / contained, as it does in present-day French, open and close varieties.

1.23 The short mid back vowel /o/ occurred 194 times and showed the following frequencies in the various positions and in free and checked syllables:

	Complete Form	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
o Free	...	15	116	0	131
o Checked	...	5	58	...	63

The long mid back vowel /o:/, like all of the long vowels except /  :/ showed a low frequency; it occurred only 4 times in the words 't  t', '  te'. Dauron makes the statement that no final /o,   :/ occurred in his speech. When Sauvage states that "notr   langu   r    t toutes sortes d   termin  sons,"²² Dauron's reply is:

Il n   s   pas ... pourqu   vous dit  s qu   la Langu   Fran  ois   r    t toutes termin  sons. Mes si j'auc   lo  sir, tant s  t peu, d'i panser: j   vous an dir   quelques un  s dont   le

²¹Dialogue, p. 18.

²²Ibid., p. 99.

n'êt point capable: nê fût cê qu'an o, e an x, e pour le moins an um.²³

1.3 The short low vowel /a/ occurred 653 times and its frequencies as a word in itself and in the various positions in free and checked syllables of words are as follows:

	Complete Form	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
a Free	79	174	216	89	558
a Checked	...	7	88	...	95

The long vowel /a:/ occurred only 5 times in such subjunctive forms as 'souhêtât', 'solicitât', and in the words 'blâmê', 'âgê'. There is no statement in the Dialogue regarding the quality of /a/ and /a:/ (whether front, central, or back), or possible allophonic variations before given consonants.²⁴ The only indication regarding the quality of /a/ is given in Dauron's description of /ã/ (see below, §1.41), from which it may be inferred that /a/ was lower than /ã/. It is probable also, as shown in the discussion of /au/ (see above, §1.122), that before non-syllabic /u/, the /a/ was farther back and higher than in other positions.

1.4 Peletier recorded four nasalized vowels. One of these is a low vowel for which he used the graphemes 'an, am, ã'. The other three nasal vowels, which were higher than the first, are: a front vowel, for which Peletier used the graphemes 'in, im, en' ('en', however, only after 'i', probably in order to avoid the awkward graphemic combination 'iin'); a front rounded vowel, for which he used the graphemes 'un, um'; and a back vowel

²³Ibid.

²⁴C. Thurot shows that during Peletier's period, the quality of /a/ before /r/ and of /e/ before /r/ was close enough to have resulted sometimes in the substitution of one phoneme for the other; but there is no indication in the Dialogue of such permutations in Peletier's speech. La Prononciation française depuis le commencement du XVIIe siècle (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1881), I, 3-4.

for which he used the graphemes 'on, om, õ'.

The 'm' and 'n' of these graphemes represent nasal resonance, and in the case of nasal 'o' and 'a' the 'm' or 'n' was replaced sometimes (but in no consistent fashion) by a tilde. In the Dialogue, Bèze tries to explain the nature of this 'n': "Nous n^o prononçons quasi point la l^etr^e n après un^e voyel^e, quand el^e ét acompagné^e d'un^e tierc^e l^etr^e: comm^e an ces moz bons, sons, cont^e, condicion, confir^e, e tous autr^es téz."²⁵ The use of 'n' or 'm' appears to depend on the nature of the following consonant; 'm' before bilabials ('amport^e', 'samblabl^e', 'comm^e') and 'n' before others ('antr^e', 'connu', 'longu^e', 'tans'). The two words 'non pas' appear often as 'nompas' and there are a number of 'on : om' rhymes in the Amour.

1.41 The three nasal vowels other than 'an, am' were probably mid vowels. There is no explicit evidence in the Dialogue regarding their range, except in the case of the back vowel, written 'on, om', where the graphemes themselves constitute the evidence. Conclusions regarding the range of the vowels written 'in, im' and 'un, um' are therefore to be reached on the basis of inference alone.

The probability is that by the sixteenth century, the earlier nasalized /i, y/ had lowered in their manner of articulation to mid vowels, for the earlier nasalized /e/ had lowered sufficiently so that in Peletier's speech it was a low nasal, indistinguishable from nasalized /a/; on this point, evidence from the Dialogue is plentiful. Peletier rejected the traditional orthographic distinction of 'en, em' and 'an, am' because, he claims, no difference between the sounds represented by each pair of graphemes is perceivable in pronunciation: "Quand vous ecriuèz

²⁵Dialogue, p. 57.

embelir, absence, orient: l'e qu' vous i m'ètèz, sonnè tout ein si qu'an Ambassadeur, puissance, riant. E ne (sic) s'i fèt aucuns diferances par ceus qui prononcèt bien."²⁶ In Spanish, on the other hand, Dauron points out, 'e' and 'a' before the nasal consonant are phonemically distinct, and the contrastive pair which he offers as proof, 'hembrè' (sic) female and 'hambrè' hunger, where "iz prononcèt l'a e l'e antandiblèmant an chacun,"²⁷ shows how close Peletier has come to a realization of the phonemic principle. Martin, one of the speakers in the Dialogue who favors traditional orthography, objects to the use of 'an, am' for 'en, em', but only on the grounds of its "strangeness": "I' trouuèrè fort etrangè qu' vous veulhèz ecrire sciance par a. Car au patron dè celui la, il faudroèt ecrire la Preposicion en, e ces mox temps, enuiè, e les samblablès, par a: chosè autant difficile a r'ècquòer qu'a changer la prolacion."²⁸ Peletier does, of course, write 'an', 'tans', 'anuie'. It is clear, then, that the earlier nasalized /e/ had lowered and coalesced with nasalized /a/. The lowering of nasalized /i/ and /y/ probably took place before the beginning of the sixteenth century, and it may be assumed that in Peletier's speech they were mid vowels. This conclusion is further borne out by the fact that in the Dialogue, the graphemes 'á' and 'õ' often replace 'an, am' and 'on, om', but *'í' and *'ũ' never replace 'in, im' and 'un, um'. The only plausible reason is that Peletier or his printer, Jean de Tournes, felt that the sounds of 'a' and 'o' were sufficiently close to 'an, am' and 'on, om', but that too great a distance separated the sounds of 'i' and 'u' from those represented by 'in, im' and 'un, um'.

Although there are no definite statements in the Dialogue

²⁶Ibid., pp. 124f.

²⁷Ibid., p. 126.

²⁸Ibid., p. 123.

regarding the quality of 'in, im', 'un, um', and 'on, om', Peletier's justification of his use of 'an, am' for traditional 'en, em' incidentally includes statements regarding the quality of the low nasal vowel. He is not satisfied with the graphemes 'an, am' and tells Meigret, after criticizing the latter's grapheme, 'ɛn', that syllables containing the sound are "autant malçesçs a representer par letres Latines, que nuls autres que nous eyons an nostre François."²⁹ Indeed, Dauron admits later in the Dialogue,

pour confesser verite, an toutes tels diccions, le son n'et pleinement e ni a (autres lequez i a diuers sons, comme diuerses mistions de deus couleurs selon le plus e le moins de chacune) toutes le son participe plus d'a que d'e. E par ce que bonnement il i faudroit une nouvelle letre, ce que je n'introdui pas bien hardiment, comme j'e ja dit quelques fois: pour le moins an atendant, il me semble meilleur d'i metre un a.³⁰

It is clear from this description that the nasalized low vowel was more forward and it was perhaps also higher than oral /a/.

Peletier's four nasalized vowels, therefore, are: mid front, front rounded, and back; and low front.

1.42 Phonemically, two classifications of these nasalized vowels are possible. They may be considered as separate phonemes (minimal contrastive pair: /a : $\tilde{a}$ /) or they may be considered allophones of /a, e, ϕ , o/.

For present-day French, the second method of classification is used by Trager in the phonemic analysis which precedes his study of verb morphology. He states: "The consonant /n/ occurs as syllable- and word-final, forming with preceding vowels the phonetic entities described as nasalized vowels: chien / $\tilde{s}ien$ / 'dog', roman /roman/ 'novel', bon /bon/ 'good' (masc.), jeun / $\tilde{z}\phi n$ / 'fasting'.³¹ This type of analysis serves to identify the two

²⁹Ibid., p. 25.

³⁰Ibid., p. 124.

³¹Trager, op. cit., p. 131.

phonological units of which a nasalized vowel is composed; /an/ therefore means /a/ + nasality. Thus, according to this analysis, each word in the pair 'a : an' contains the phoneme /a/; the semantic difference between them is due to the fact that the second word consists of more than /a/ for it contains also nasality, and may therefore be written phonemically as /an/ if the analyst makes clear, as Trager of course does, the conditions governing the complementary distribution of the allophones of /n/.

There is, however, a serious objection to this analysis. The /a/ and the nasality occur at the same time but the analysis separates these components and the phonemic script makes it appear as if they were successive rather than simultaneous. The general principle regarding the analysis of simultaneous and successive phonological units is thus stated by Vachek:

The phoneme equals the phonological unit so long as the unit remains single; as soon as there are two or more simultaneous phonological units, they all enter the same, and one single phoneme. Two or more successive phonological units, on the other hand, are equal to as many (two or more) phonemes. To put it differently: there can, and do, exist simultaneous phonological units but there cannot occur simultaneous phonemes.³²

It is, however, possible to make a phonemic analysis on the basis of simultaneous components, even for segmental phonemes, as demonstrated by Zellig S. Harris,³³ but in his presentation of this type of analysis, he chooses symbols which clearly indicate simultaneity. It is possible, Harris contends, to replace whole phonemic systems by component systems,³⁴ but before the principle of components can be applied widely in phonemics, the proper tech-

³²Josef Vachek, "Phonemes and Phonological Units," Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague, VI (1936), 238.

³³Zellig S. Harris, "Simultaneous Components in Phonology," Language, XX (October-December, 1944), 181-205.

³⁴Ibid., p. 205.

niques must be worked out in a larger number of sample cases and general agreement regarding the usefulness of this type of analysis must be reached. For the present, therefore, Peletier's four nasalized vowels will be treated as separate vowel phonemes: /ã, ẽ, õ, ɶ/.

1.43 The number of occurrences of these phonemes in the portion checked is: /ã/ 427, /ẽ/ 123, /õ/ 295, /ɶ/ 23. The number of occurrences in the various positions is as follows:

	Complete Form	Initial	Medial	Final	Total
ã Free	53	99	69	50	271
ã Checked	...	0	156	...	156
ẽ Free	...	21	17	58	96
ẽ Checked	...	1	26	...	27
õ Free	15	22	122	78	237
õ Checked	...	8	50	...	58
ɶ Free	16	0	0	4	20
ɶ Checked	...	3	0	...	3

All of the nasal vowels except /ɶ/ appeared after non-syllabic /l/; /ã/ and /õ/ appeared after non-syllabic /y/; none of them appeared after non-syllabic /u/. At first glance one is tempted to regard Peletier's transcription 'oin' as a combination of the graphemes 'o' + 'in'. Then, just as 'o' + 'ɛ' transcribes /uɛ/, 'o' + 'in' might be considered as Peletier's transcription for /uẽ/. Such an analysis would appear to be strengthened by the fact that the oral diphthong /oi/ did not occur (words like 'loyal' are to be analyzed as /lo + ial/). There is no reason to assume, however, that the absence of the oral diphthong /oi/ is an indication of the absence of a nasal diphthong [õi]. Peletier's transcription 'oin' is of no help in deciding this matter, for just as his 'an' transcribes /ã/, so may his 'oin' transcribe a nasalized 'oi', phonemically /õ/ + an allophone of /i/ (nasal-

lized and non-syllabic after a nasal vowel phoneme). It is impossible therefore to judge from the text alone whether the combination of graphemes 'oin' was intended to represent /uẽ/ or /õĩ/. The shift in stress which produced the change /õĩ/ to /uẽ/ was completed after the period in which the Dialogue was written if the evidence brought by Thurot is taken into account, for he states: "Tous les auteurs du XVII^e siècle attestent qu'on entendait distinctement l'o et l'i dans oin."³⁵ Thus Peletier's graphemic combination 'oin' in all probability transcribes /õĩ/.

The nasal vowels in the portion checked did not appear before the liquid consonants with the exception of a single /ãr/, 'Henri'. The nasal vowels did appear before /m/ and /n/ and the combination /ñ + m, n + V/ which is rare in present-day French was quite frequent in Peletier's speech; of 69 occurrences of free /ã/ medially, 2 were followed by /m/ and 4 by /n/; of 122 occurrences of free /õ/ medially, 37 were followed by /m/ and 36 by /n/; of 17 occurrences of free /ẽ/ medially, 2 were followed by /n/; free /ñ/ did not occur in medial position in the portion checked. Peletier distinguishes in his graphemic system between /ñn/ or /ñm/ and /Vn/ or /Vm/ by the use of a double 'm' or 'n' (or a tilde replacing the first 'm, n'); thus, 'commñ' or 'cõñ' /kõñ/, 'donñ' or 'dõñ' /dõñ/, but 'am' /ãm/, 'nonostant' /nonostãt/. He criticizes Meigret's transcriptions of 'bonñ', 'commñ', 'connu', 'commñ', 'homñ', 'honneur' without the double 'm, n' because, Peletier says, these words are not pronounced "par o simplñ."³⁶

In checked syllables, the nasal vowels were followed only by /s, t/, except for /õ/ which in a single word ('donq', often

³⁵Thurot, op. cit., II, 491.

³⁶Dialogue, p. 22.

however appearing as 'donqu~~s~~') was followed by /k/. The checked nasal vowels occurred before these consonant phonemes with the following frequencies:

/v/	/Vs/	/vt/
ã	122	34
ẽ	14	13
õ	30	26
ø	3	0

